

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are pending. Claims 1, 7, and 20 are currently amended. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 6-8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito (Japanese Application 03-300482) (hereinafter "Saito") in view of Fairbanks et al. (U.S. Patent 5307003) (hereinafter "Fairbanks"). The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Fairbanks and further in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0255174) (hereinafter "Chen"). The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Fairbanks and Chen, and further in view of Wittlinger (U.S. Publication 2004/0178940) (hereinafter "Wittlinger"). The Examiner has rejected claims 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent 5841313) (hereinafter "Levin"). The Examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito and Levin and further in view of Wittlinger. The Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito and Levin and further in view of Chen.

1. Independent Claims 1 and 7

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been rejected by the Examiner as being obvious over Saito and Fairbanks. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The combination of Saito and Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest the following required elements

of independent claims 1 and 7: (a) “identifying by an array controller the loss of operation of a power supply of the redundant power supply array,” and (b) “wherein the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of the array is less than the total rated capacity of the fully operational array.” The Specification discusses in paragraph [0016] that an array controller (16) monitors the power output of each power supply and identifies when a power supply fails or is removed from the computer system. The Specification also differentiates between the rated capacity of the remaining **functioning** power supply and that of the **full** power array. (Spec., p.8:5-10)

The combination of Saito and Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest “identifying *by an array controller* the loss of operation of a power supply of the redundant power supply array.” Neither Saito nor Fairbanks teaches or suggests an array controller for a redundant array of power supplies. In the figure presented in Saito, no array controller is shown (as elements 8a-8c are power supplies). Additionally, the cited portion of Saito, namely paragraphs [0012] and [0013], fail to teach or suggest that any such array controller could be used to identify the loss of operation of a power supply of a redundant power supply array. The Examiner does not cite to Fairbanks as teaching the “identifying” step, and, as stated above, Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest an array controller for a redundant array of power supplies, and as such, does not remedy the deficiencies of Saito.

Additionally, Saito fails to teach or suggest “wherein the total rated capacity of the *functioning* power supplies of the array is *less than* the total rated capacity of the *fully operational* array.” In fact, Saito teaches that the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies is the **same** as the total rated capacity of the array when it is fully operational. (Saito, [0012]) Saito discusses having 3 power supplies individually rated to provide 50A but setting a

total **rated capacity** of the fully operational array to only 100A (instead of the maximum possible power draw of 150A), such that when one of the 3 power supplies fails, the **same total rated capacity** of 100A is still met by the functioning power supplies of the array. (Saito, [0012]) The Examiner claims that the total rated capacity of the fully operational array in Saito is 150A. (Office Action, p.2) However, it is clear from Saito that 150A is the maximum power draw, and not the total rated capacity of the fully operational array-- the total rated capacity of both the fully operational and diminished array in Saito is 100A. (Saito, [0012]) Thus, Saito teaches that the rated capacity of the **full** array and the **diminished** array (when one of the power supply units fails) is the **same**. This is in direct contrast to the present invention, in which the rated capacity of the functional remainder of an array is **less** than the full capacity, thus necessitating the reduction of processor power consumption. Additionally, Fairbanks fails to remedy this deficiency. There is no mention of the capacity or rating of a power supply unit, and specifically, Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of an array being less than the total rated capacity of the array when it is fully operational.

Thus, the combination of Saito and Fairbanks fail to teach or suggest these required elements of independent claims 1 and 7, and therefore, the combination fails to render these claims obvious. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

2. Independent Claim 20

Independent claim 20 has been rejected by the Examiner as being obvious over Saito and Levin. However, the combination of Saito and Levin fails to teach or suggest the required elements of claim 20: (a) "identifying by an array controller the loss of operation of a

power supply of the redundant power supply array,” and (b) “wherein the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of the array is less than the total rated capacity of the fully operational array.” Saito fails to teach or suggest these claimed elements for the reasons stated above with respect to independent claims 1 and 7. Additionally, Levin does not discuss power supply ratings or capacities at all, and thus fails to teach or suggest the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of an array being less than the total rated capacity of the array when it is fully operational. Finally, Levin fails to discuss array controllers, and as such, does not teach or suggest element (a) above. Thus, the combination of Saito and Levin fails to teach or suggest these required elements of independent claim 20, and therefore, the combination fails to render this claim obvious. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.


3. Dependent Claims

The pending dependent claims will not be discussed individually herein, as they depend from otherwise allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23, and 24 of the present invention, as amended, are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the pending claims be withdrawn and that these claims be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Fulghum', is written over a horizontal line.

Roger Fulghum Registration No. 39,678

Baker Botts L.L.P.
910 Louisiana St.
One Shell Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
(713) 229-1707

Baker Botts Docket Number: 016295.1560

Date: August 3, 2007